



**CONSOLE
MATTIACCI**
LAW

Fighting For Employee Rights for Over 30 Years

1525 Locust Street	9th Floor	Philadelphia, PA 19102	215-545-7676	www.ConsoleLaw.com
110 Marter Avenue	Suite 502	Moorestown, NJ 08057	856-854-4000	
5 Penn Plaza	23rd Floor	New York, NY 10001	917-985-7761	
744 W Lancaster Ave.	Suite 220	Wayne, PA 19087	610-596-9796	

LAURA C. MATTIACCI, ESQ.
Mattiacci@consolelaw.com
215.689.4137 (Fax)

August 3, 2023

Via e-mail

Chambers of Judge Joel H. Slomsky@paed.uscourts.gov

The Honorable Joel H. Slomsky
 U.S. District Court of New Jersey
 Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse
 4th & Cooper Streets Room 1050
 Camden, NJ 08101

Re: Phillips, Shannon v. Starbucks Corporation, et al.
Civil Action No. 19-19432

Dear Judge Slomsky:

I write in response to Defendant, Starbucks Corporation's ("Defendant"), letter seeking leave of Court to file a "short response" to Plaintiff's Motion For Economic Loss Damages [Dkt. Ent. 175.] Notably, Defendant did not seek consent of Plaintiff prior to asking the Court for leave to file additional briefing. This Court set the briefing schedule on July 19, 2023 at the conclusion of the economic loss hearing and the briefing schedule was never objected to by Defendant. Plaintiff complied with the Court's Order to submit briefing in support of her request for economic damages and objects to Defendant's allegation that "Plaintiff modeled her brief as a Response in Opposition to Defendant's brief."

Defendant has had more time and opportunity than is given in most cases to present its position on Plaintiff's economic damages to the Court. Defendant presented its evidence and arguments through: direct and cross examination of witnesses, including experts, over several hours; during oral argument on Plaintiff's *motion in limine* to limit the testimony of Defendant's expert (which was also fully briefed); and, by way of its own lengthy memorandum submitted this past Friday.

The Hon. Joel H. Slomsky, U.S.D.J.

August 3, 2023

Page 2 of 2

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court deny Defendant's request to provide additional briefing and oral argument, which is not necessary, was never previously requested, and only serves to delay final resolution of the case.

If the Court grants Defendant's request, Plaintiff requests that she also be permitted to file a "short response" to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion (Dkt. No. 175) and Defendant's "short response" to Plaintiff's Motion for Economic Loss Damages.

Respectfully submitted,



LAURA C. MATTIACCI

cc: Kate C. Oeltjen, Esquire
Holly W. Smith, Esquire
Tara S. Param, Esquire
Richard Harris, Esquire